



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Joseph H. Beale, "The Progress of the Law: The Conflict of Laws," 34 HARV. L. REV. 50, 52. But see 20 COL. L. REV. 87. An intent to retain an abandoned domicil should have no more effect than an intent to create a new one.

CONTRACTS — RESCISSION FOR MUTUAL MISTAKE OF FACT. — The defunct B bank entered into a contract with the S bank whereby the S bank agreed to take over the assets and assume all the liabilities of the B bank, and to hold the stockholders of the B bank harmless; and M, a principal stockholder in the B bank, agreed to buy some of its fixed assets from the S bank. After this agreement between the banks was made, L, an officer of the S bank, entered into a contract with M to buy all of his stock in the B bank. Unknown to all the parties a defalcation had occurred, and the assets of the B bank were really only about 50% of the amount represented by its books. The S bank refused to proceed with its contract, and a new one was executed in which the stockholders of the B bank agreed to an assessment on their stock to make up the deficiency. L brought suit to rescind his contract with M. *Held*, that the relief be granted. *Lindeberg v. Murray*, 201 Pac. 759 (Wash.).

For a discussion of the principles involved, see NOTES, *supra*, p. 757.

CORPORATIONS — PROMOTERS — LIABILITY OF PROMOTER TO CORPORATION PROMOTED ON ISSUE OF STOCK FOR OVERVALUED PROPERTY. — In preparation for the organization of the A Corporation, X, the promoter, entered into contracts with the stockholders of B Corporation whereby they agreed to receive for each share of B stock one share of A stock, upon the formation of A Corporation. Unknown to the B stockholders, X obtained an option from Y to purchase, for \$50000 of A stock, the secret formulae owned by Y and used in the business of the B Corporation. Later, the A Corporation, with X in complete control through the use of dummy directors, was organized with a capital stock of \$500000. X caused \$15000 capital stock of A Corporation to be issued to the B stockholders in accordance with the above agreement. X also caused \$300000 capital stock of A Corporation to be issued to Y, who held this stock for the benefit of X. X sold this stock to innocent purchasers and kept the proceeds. The A Corporation sues X, alleging the above facts and that the formulae were of no value. *Held*, that a demurrer to the complaint be overruled. *American Barley Co. v. McCourtie*, 185 N. W. 506 (Minn.).

With a laudable desire to redress a palpable fraud, judges are too apt blindly to permit a corporation to recover "secret profits" from its promoters, regardless of whether or not the corporation has been damaged. It is submitted that, in situations where corporate creditors are not involved, the cases should be divided into two classes. Where the corporation conveys its assets or executes its obligation in return for overvalued property sold to it by promoters, the corporation (unless it has acted through an independent and informed board of directors) can obtain redress for the wrong done it. *Erlanger v. New Sombrero Phosphate Co.*, 3 App. Cas. 1218; *Davis v. Las Ovas Co.*, 227 U. S. 80; *South Joplin Land Co. v. Case*, 104 Mo. 572, 16 S. W. 390. See 1 MORAWETZ, PRIVATE CORPORATIONS, 2 ed., §§ 291-292. But where, as in the principal case, all that the corporation did was to issue its stock for the promoters' property, the corporation has not been damaged; for a share of stock is not an asset or an obligation of the corporation issuing it — it is merely the holder's fractional interest in the corporation. See R. D. Weston, "Promoters' Liability: Old Dominion *v.* Bigelow," 30 HARV. L. REV. 39. Cf. *Old Dominion Copper Co. v. Lewisohn*, 210 U. S. 206. *Contra*, *Old Dominion Copper Co. v. Bigelow*, 203 Mass. 159, 89 N. E. 103; *Pietsch v. Milbrath*, 123 Wis. 647, 101 N. W. 388, 102 N. W. 342. See also 22 HARV. L. REV. 48; 58 UNIV. OF PA. L. REV. 226. It has been suggested that the repentant corporation might sue the promoters and recover as trustee for those actually damaged. Cf.